| **Student Name:** Stephanie Kwok |
| --- |

| **Motion:** This house will abolish the powers of executive pardons |
| --- |

| Student spoke for the duration of the specified time frame. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | **5** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student offered and/or accepted a point of information relevant to the topic. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | **5** |
| Student spoke in a stylistic and persuasive manner (e.g. volume, speed, tone, diction, and flow). | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student’s argument is complete in that it has relevant Claims, supported by sufficient Evidence/Warrants, Impacts, and Synthesis. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student argument reflects application of theory taught during class time. | N/A | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | **5** |
| Student’s rebuttal is effective, and directly responds to an opponent’s arguments. | **N/A** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Student ably supported teammate’s case and arguments. | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Student applied feedback from previous debate(s). | N/A | 1 | 2 | **3** | 4 | 5 |
| Competition Score: | 71 | | | | | |
| Rubric  1 - Unobserved.  2 - Student attempt noted. Needs extended teacher support to properly execute skill.  3 - Student effort noted. Can execute skill with minimal teacher input and guidance.  4 - Student can execute skill with little to no prompting.  5 - Student can execute skill without prompting; exceeds expectations for child of that level. | | | | | | |
| **Teacher comments:**  [NOTE: Today’s speeches are 7 minutes’ long.]  The focal point on checks-and-balances may not be the best angle since pardons are also a form of check and balance, but the latter point on pardons being abused is spot on.   * Spend even more time on this idea about the devolution of democracy. * Well done with the Hunter Biden example and Joe Biden turning back against his own campaign promise.   + We’re spending way too much time here, the hook should be done by the 1st minute, rather than a few minutes of mechanistic analysis on abuses happening.     - You also have to give a reason as to WHY abuses by the executive are so prevalent. Why are pardons so prevalent other than protecting family and friends?       * Profit-motivated. E.g. Lobbyists donate to their political campaigns in order to secure their inner circle.       * Political patronage. E.g. All Republican presidents have pardoned their predecessors who have committed political crimes.   I appreciate that on a balance, pardons are a poor use to the high volume of systemic abuses, and they are highly bureaucratic.   * Good observation on the limited accessibility!   We can’t be going into the set-up only at the 4th minute:   * Point out that pardons are an absolute exercise of power and could not be checked by the courts or reversed by the legislature.   + However, it’s not true that there’s zero checks because Presidents could face electoral accountability in the next election.     - So you can bring up the fact that they often do this at the very end of their term when they can no longer stand for another election. * HOW are your systemic changes FEASIBLE?   + Give me an alternative check and balance to deal with the ability of the executive to counter the failures of the judiciary and legislative. * What is your burden/winning pathway?   While I understand that pardons could not be checked, hammer down even more the incentives to exercise it abusively.   * What does it mean to do this for politician gain?   + Explain president Ford pardoning president Nixon for all of his political crimes in order to protect his own party. * Aside from friends and family, how else do pardons get abused?   + We can’t just be making HYPOTHETICAL harms of Trump pardoning Epstein. Why would these types of pardons be prevalent without any real checks?     - Why won’t electoral mechanisms be an adequate form of accountability to prevent abusive parties from getting into power?   After reinforcing abuse, it isn’t clear why this outweighs the exclusive use of pardons for a positive end. I cannot see how these alternatives can be effectively used to mitigate the harms of Opp.   * We need to have some practical implications of derogating democratic norms, what actually happens on the ground?   We need to restructure our speech. The hook should be less than a minute, the set-up needs to be done by 2:30 maximum, and we need to signpost as well as flag each argument clearly.  Good job offering POIs today!  7.13 | | | | | | |